[27th August 1926

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" As regards that department, the District Judge writes that there have been no non-Brahman clerks in his district so well qualified as to justify their being given a rapid promotion over the heads of their seniors."

Mr A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Have not the Government issued an order that the two chief ministerial posts in the district offices should not be held by members of the same community ? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" There is such an order in the Revenue Department, but I am not aware of any such order as regards the Judicial Department."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Well in that case, assuming, as the hon. the Law Member says that there are no qualified people in that district, what is there to prevent their transferring qualified people from other places to restore the existing inequality ? "

Mr. R. VEERIAN :—" May I know whether the Government have called for the reports stating the names of persons, the services they have put in, the educational qualifications and other tests they have passed so as to find out whether there are actually suitable persons or not belonging to other communities . . ."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" That is a separate question."

Mr. R. VEERIAN :—" I wanted to know if the statement of the District Judge was verified or not by the Government ? "

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Order, order. That must be put as a separate question."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" May I ask the hon. the Law Member if the vacancy should necessarily be filled up by suitable postings of subordinates of the same office or district ? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" Generally, appointments are made from the same district but there is no rule to prevent the appointment of persons from outside the office or district."

Irrigation.

Submersion of lands due to the change of the Cauvery left flood bank.

* 2361 Q.—Mr. T. M. NARAYANASWAMI PILLAI : Will the hon. the Law Member and the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the left flood bank of the Cauvery at Kambarasampettai was thrown hundreds of yards to the south of the original flood bank ;

(*b*) whether in consequence a number of acres became part of the river bed of the Cauvery ;

(*c*) whether the Collector originally published a declaration that all the lands submerged would be acquired ;

(*d*) whether the Government subsequently changed it and limited the acquisition only to the lands actually covered by the new flood bank ;

(*e*) whether there have been numerous representations claiming damages and compensation for the lands submerged ; and

(*f*) whether the Government propose to pay such compensation and damages ?

27th August 1926]

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) What is referred to is apparently the right and not left flood bank. An estimate for diverting the Cauvery right flood bank from the Municipal Pumping station to the Kodamurti bridge was approved by Government in October 1925; but the exact distance between the original flood bank and the proposed flood bank is not known.

(*c*) *to* (*f*) The question whether the construction of a new flood bank entails on the Government a liability to compensate the holders of lands between the old and the new flood banks is under examination.

Repairs to the Manur channel in Tinnevelly taluk.

*2362 Q.—Mr. Chavadi K. Subrahmanya Pillai: With reference to question No. 2130 [clauses (*a*) to (*c*) and (*e*) to (*g*)], regarding complete repairs to the Manur channel in Tinnevelly taluk of the Tinnevelly district, which is under contemplation for many years, and answered at the meeting held on 16th July 1926, will the hon. the Law Member and the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether any report has been received from the departments concerned of the Government on the subject; and

(*b*) if so, to place the same on the Council table at its next meeting to be held in August 1926?

A.—Yes. The Government have received a report. The facts are as follows. As a result of investigation by the Tank Restoration Scheme Party in 1916, an estimate for general improvements to the Manur channel amounting to Rs. 62,000 was prepared in 1917. Owing to the fact that the ayacut under the channel is partly Government and partly estate land, it was necessary to distribute the cost and the Collector was asked to arrange for a contribution from the proprietors concerned, viz., the Zamindar of Uthumalai and the Inamdar of Kokkuparaikulam.

At that time (1918) the Collector did not regard the matter as urgent, and the proposals were shelved The matter was taken up again in 1923, at the instance of the then Collector and it was reported that the estimate would, at current rates, come to Rs. 85,000. Meanwhile the question of contribution has become complicated by the fact that the Uthumalai Estate is now in the hands of a Receiver appointed by the District Court, and doubts have arisen regarding his capacity to bind the Estate in the matter. This question is still under correspondence between the Collector and the Public Works Department. Steps are also being taken to assess the shares to which each party is liable, which have been provisionally put by the Executive Engineer at—

	PER CENT.
(i) Uthumalai	22·23
(ii) Kokkuparaikulam	4·03
(iii) Government	73·74

In the meantime, the Executive Engineer has, in the exercise of his powers, sanctioned estimates for silt clearance and repair of breaches from time to time as required. No estimate has been sanctioned in the current year.